

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated November 23, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on February 23, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-13 and 63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by *Ronnekleiv* (WIPO Publication WO 00/79335 A1). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Further, the elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Claims 1 and 63 recite "switching a polarization of one pulse in each successive pulse pair defined by the plurality of pulses to create at least four different pulse pairs." This switching is illustrated in Figure 2 of the present application. In contrast, a method disclosed in *Ronnekleiv* switches between two polarization states (see, Figure 2) without any indication that the method provides the claimed four different pulse pairs.

Therefore, Applicants submit that *Ronnekleiv* fails to teach, show or suggest each and every element of claim 1 or 63. Applicants submit that claims 1 and 63 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 14-49, 62 and 64 are allowed. Applicants acknowledge allowance of the claims. Regarding the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance, Applicants note

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. WEAT/0347

that claim 14 recites "one or more independent transmitted Stokes vectors" and not "at least four independent Stokes vectors."

Conclusion

The references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77058
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)